



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,786	02/13/2002	John E. Holland	3781-002 (03781.0024.1)	9809

7590 03/17/2003

Lewis S. Rowell
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
1900 First Union Tower
300 North Greene Street
Greensboro, NC 27401

EXAMINER

MAYO III, WILLIAM H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2831

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/075,786

Applicant(s)

HOLLAND ET AL. 

Examiner

William H. Mayo III

Art Unit

2831

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on January 21, 2003. These drawings are not approved the cross hatching that indicates the insulator and outer jacket materials is incorrect. The applicant states that the insulator material and the outer jacket materials are made of thermoplastic materials. The applicant should refer to MPEP Section 608.02 for the proper cross-hatching of thermoplastic materials.

Correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-13 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 14-26. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

3. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 15, line 2, replace the term "strength", with the term --performance--. In claim 28, lines 1-2, replace the term "strength", with the term --performance--. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2831

Double Patenting

4. Claims 1-13 and 14-26 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-13 of copending Application No. 09/860,423. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2831

7. Claims 1-9, 14-22, and 27-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrieu (Pat Num 5,300,337) in view of Holland et al (Pat Num 5,395,682, herein referred to as Holland). Andrieu discloses a protective cover (Figs 1-4) for cables or hoses (abstract), which are capable of being used in environments wherein the cover (Figs 1-4) may be subject to abrasion and weather extremes (i.e. heat, Col 1, lines 12-20). Specifically, with respect to claims 1 & 14, Andrieu discloses a protective cover (10) comprising a sleeve (Figs 1-2, Col 3, lines 55-59) capable of surrounding a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4), wherein the sleeve has open ends (left and right ends) and is formed of a fabric (10) made of substantially high strength yarn (11, i.e. polyester, Col 3, lines 8-12). With respect to claims 2 & 15, Andrieu discloses that the fabric (11) is formed from at least 70 percent high strength yarns (i.e. 100 % polyester). With respect to claims 6 & 19, Andrieu discloses that the high strength yarn (11, i.e. polyester) is about 400 to 1000 denier (i.e. 600-2500, Col 3, lines 60-67). With respect to claims 7 & 20, Andrieu discloses that the fabric covering (10) has a warp and fill density of about 40 ends per inch (Col 4, lines 1-10). With respect to claims 8 & 21, Andrieu discloses that the sleeve (Fig 1) is formed as an elongated sheet having opposing longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges), wherein the opposed longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges) includes means (15) for releasably attaching the opposed longitudinally edges together (Col 4, lines 24-31) around the length of a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claims 9 & 22, Andrieu discloses that the means (15) for fastening the longitudinal edges comprises hook and loop material (see 15, Col 4, lines 35-47). With respect to claim 27, Andrieu discloses an abrasion

Art Unit: 2831

resistant cable system (Fig 4) comprising a cable (not numbered) that is subject to being periodically moved across abrasion surfaces (Col 1, lines 12-20) and a protective sleeve (10) surrounding the cable, which is formed from a fabric made of substantially high performance yarn (i.e. polyester), has open ends (left and right ends), and protects the cable (Fig 4) from abrasion and wear thereof (Col 1, lines 12-20). With respect to claim 28, Andrieu discloses that the fabric (11) is formed from at least 70 percent high strength yarns (i.e. 100 % polyester). With respect to claim 32, Andrieu discloses that the high strength yarn (11, i.e. polyester) is about 400 to 1000 denier (i.e. 600-2500, Col 3, lines 60-67). With respect to claim 33, Andrieu discloses that the fabric covering (10) has a warp and fill density of about 40 ends per inch (Col 4, lines 1-10). With respect to claim 34, Andrieu discloses that the sleeve (Fig 1) is formed as an elongated sheet having opposing longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges), wherein the opposed longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges) includes means (15) for releasably attaching the opposed longitudinally edges together (Col 4, lines 24-31) around the length of a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claim 35, Andrieu discloses that the means (15) for fastening the longitudinal edges comprises hook and loop material (see 15, Col 4, lines 35-47).

However, Andrieu doesn't necessarily disclose the protective cover being made of a high performance yarns having a tensile modulus equal to or greater than 150g/denier and a tenacity equal to or greater than 7 grams/denier, wherein the yarns are cut and tear resistant (claims 1, 14, & 27), nor the protective cover being made of a material fabric having a weight of between of between about 5 & 8 ounces per square

Art Unit: 2831

yard (claims 3, 16, & 29), nor the fabric being resistant to petroleum based products (claims 4, 17, & 30), nor the high strength yarn being selected from the group consisting of long chain polyethylenes, high strength aramids, liquid crystal polymers, and combinations thereof (claims 5, 18, & 31), nor the fabric density of between about 30 and 36 inches per inch (claims 7, 20, & 33).

Holland teaches a protective cover, that is made of Spectra® fibers (Col 2, lines 28-37), that overcomes the disadvantages of polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment (Col 1, lines 5-10). Specifically, with respect to claims 1 & 14, Holland teaches that the protective cover is made of high performance yarns, such as Spectra® fibers that inherently has a tensile modulus equal to or greater than 150g/denier and a tenacity equal to or greater than 7 grams/denier. With respect to claims 3 & 16, Holland teaches that the fibers may be used to form a fabric having a weight of between about 5 & 8 ounces per square yard (Col 2, lines 49-51) for the purpose of providing a fabric that is lightweight while also providing a sufficient strength and durability to withstand the use and environment to the fabric is exposed (Col 2, lines 51-56). With respect to claims 4 & 17, Holland teaches that the fabric formed of Spectra® fibers are chemical resistance to petroleum-based products (Col 4, lines 45-51). With respect to claims 5 & 18, Holland teaches that the fabric containing Spectra® fibers, which are long chain extended polyethylene (Col 2, lines 25-30). With respect to claims 7 & 20, Holland teaches that the fabric may be constructed to have a warp and fill density of between 30 and 36 ends per inch (Col 2, lines 49-51).

Art Unit: 2831

With respect to claims 27, Holland teaches that the protective cover is made of high performance yarns, such as Spectra® fibers that inherently has a tensile modulus equal to or greater than 150g/denier and a tenacity equal to or greater than 7 grams/denier.

With respect to claim 29, Holland teaches that the fibers may be used to form a fabric having a weight of between about 5 & 8 ounces per square yard (Col 2, lines 49-51) for the purpose of providing a fabric that is lightweight while also providing a sufficient strength and durability to withstand the use and environment to the fabric is exposed (Col 2, lines 51-56). With respect to claim 30, Holland teaches that the fabric formed of Spectra® fibers are chemical resistance to petroleum-based products (Col 4, lines 45-51). With respect to claim 31, Holland teaches that the fabric containing Spectra® fibers, which are long chain extended polyethylene (Col 2, lines 25-30). With respect to claim 33, Holland teaches that the fabric may be constructed to have a warp and fill density of between 30 and 36 ends per inch (Col 2, lines 49-51).

With respect to claims 1-9, 14-22, and 27-35, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of cables at the time the invention was made to modify the protective cover, which is made of polyester fibers, of Andrieu to comprise the Spectra® fibers and the fabric parameters of the protective fabric as taught by Holland because Holland teaches that such a fabric by made of commercially available Spectra® fibers and having the specified parameters, overcomes the disadvantages of polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment in which the cover is used (Col 1, lines 5-10) and since it has been held to be within general skill of a

Art Unit: 2831

worker in the art to select a commercially available or known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

8. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratigan (Pat Num 5,441,790) in view of Holland et al (Pat Num 5,395,682). Ratigan discloses a protective cover (1) for use with a rope (Figs 1-4), and which is used in environments in which lengths of the rope are subject to abrasion (Col 1, lines 5-10). Specifically, with respect to claim 40, Ratigan discloses an abrasion resistant rope (5) of the type that is capable of periodically moved across abrasive surfaces (Col 1, lines 62-68) comprising a sleeve (Fig 1) surrounding a length of a rope (5), wherein the sleeve (Fig 1) is formed of a fabric (i.e. textile material) made of substantially high strength yarn (i.e. polyester fibers, Col 2, lines 1-3).

However, Ratigan doesn't necessarily disclose the protective cover being made of a high performance yarns having a tensile modulus equal to or greater than 150g/denier and a tenacity equal to or greater than 7 grams/denier, wherein the sleeve is cut resistant or cut resistant (claim 40).

Holland teaches a protective cover, that is made of Spectra® fibers (Col 2, lines 28-37), that overcomes the disadvantages of polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment (Col 1, lines 5-10). Specifically, with respect to claim 40, Holland teaches that the protective cover is made of high

Art Unit: 2831

performance yarns, such as Spectra® fibers that inherently has a tensile modulus equal to or greater than 150g/denier and a tenacity equal to or greater than 7 grams/denier.

With respect to claim 40, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of cables at the time the invention was made to modify the protective cover, which is made of polyester fibers, of Andrieu to comprise the Spectra® fibers and the fabric parameters of the protective fabric as taught by Holland because Holland teaches that such a fabric by made of commercially available Spectra® fibers and having the specified parameters, overcomes the disadvantages of polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment in which the cover is used (Col 1, lines 5-10) and since it has been held to be within general skill of a worker in the art to select a commercially available or known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

9. Claims 10-12, 24-26, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrieu (Pat Num 5,300,337) in view of Holland et al (Pat Num 5,395,682, herein referred to as modified Andrieu), as applied to claims 1, 14, and 27 above, further in view of Kite, III et al (Pat Num 4,891,256, herein referred to as Kite). Modified Andrieu discloses a protective cover (Figs 1-4) for cables or hoses (abstract), which are capable of being used in environments wherein the cover (Figs 1-4) may be subject to abrasion and weather extremes (i.e. heat, Col 1, lines 12-20) as described above. Specifically, with respect to claims 10 & 24, modified Andrieu discloses a protective cover (10) comprising a sleeve (Figs 1-2, Col 3, lines 55-59) capable of

Art Unit: 2831

surrounding a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claims 11 & 25, modified Andrieu discloses that the sleeve (Fig 1) is formed having opposing longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges), wherein the opposed longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges) includes means (15) for releasably attaching the opposed longitudinally edges together (Col 4, lines 24-31) around the length of a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claims 12 & 26, modified Andrieu discloses that the means (15) for fastening the longitudinal edges comprises hook and loop material (see 15, Col 4, lines 35-47). With respect to claim 36, modified Andrieu discloses a protective cover (10) comprising a sleeve (Figs 1-2, Col 3, lines 55-59) capable of surrounding a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claim 37, modified Andrieu discloses that the sleeve (Fig 1) is formed having opposing longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges), wherein the opposed longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges) includes means (15) for releasably attaching the opposed longitudinally edges together (Col 4, lines 24-31) around the length of a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claim 38, modified Andrieu discloses that the means (15) for fastening the longitudinal edges comprises hook and loop material (see 15, Col 4, lines 35-47).

However, modified Andrieu doesn't necessarily disclose the sleeve being a plurality of bands comprising a short length of the fabric and being spaced apart along the length of the cable or hose (claims 10, 24, & 36), nor each band having opposed longitudinally edges including means for fastening the opposed longitudinally edges together around the length of the cable (claims 11, 25, & 37).

Kite teaches a wraparound closure device (Figs 1-4) made of a fabric that protects elongated substrates, such as cables, from abrasion (Col 1, lines 5-10). Specifically, with respect to claims 10, 24, & 36, Kite teaches a wraparound sleeve (10-Fig 3) that may be made of polyester (Col 4, line 49-50) and is formed as a plurality of bands (see three fabric sleeves not numbered) wherein each band comprises a short length of the fabric which are spaced apart along the length of the cable (Fig 3) for the purpose of providing effective bundling device that accommodates multiple cable break-outs (Col 1, lines 38-45). With respect to claims 11, 25, & 37, Kite teaches that each short length of fabric (see 3 section of fabric, Fig 3) having opposed longitudinally edges (left and right sides of all three fabrics) wherein the opposed longitudinally edges has means (24, 30, & 32) for fastening the opposed longitudinally edges together around a length of the cable (Fig 3).

With respect to claims 10-11, 24-25, & 36-37, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of cables at the time the invention was made to modify the polyester protective cover of modified Andrieu to comprise a multiple protective covers as taught by the Kite because Kite teaches that such a fabric configuration protects elongated articles from abrasion (Col 4, lines 5-8) and provides effective bundling device that accommodates multiple cable break-outs (Col 1, lines 38-45) and since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. (*St. Regis Paper Co v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8).

10. Claims 13, 26, & 39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrieu (Pat Num 5,300,337) in view of Holland et al (Pat Num 5,395,682, herein

Art Unit: 2831

referred to as modified Andrieu), as applied to claims 1, 14, and 27 above, further in view of Holt et al (Pat Num 5,070,597, herein referred to as Holt). Modified Andrieu discloses a protective cover (Figs 1-4) for cables or hoses (abstract), which are capable of being used in environments wherein the cover (Figs 1-4) may be subject to abrasion and weather extremes (i.e. heat, Col 1, lines 12-20) as detailed above with reference to claims 1 & 14.

However, modified Andrieu doesn't necessarily disclose the protective cover further comprising a hood made of the same fabric and fastened to at least one end of the sleeve for protecting the exposed end of the cable or hose (claims 13, 26, & 39).

Holt teaches a double wall protective cover (Figs 1-19b) comprising flame retardant, abrasion resistance, and split or tear resistance (Col 18, lines 21-26), for the purpose of providing environmental protection, including electrical protection, and joining or mechanical holding of substrates such as cables or pipes (Col 1, lines 17-21). Specifically, with respect to claims 13, 26, & 39, Holt discloses that the protective cover (Figs 1-19b) may be formed of polyester (Col 7, line 36) and as a hood (i.e. end cap, 19, Figs 6a-d), wherein the hood (19) may be fastened to at least one end of the cable or pipe (22) for protecting the exposed end of the cable or pipe (22, Col 29, lines 23-24).

With respect to claims 13, 26, & 39, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of cables at the time the invention was made to modify the cable or pipe assembly of modified Andrieu to comprise a end cap protective cover formed of fabric as taught by the Holt because Holt teaches that fabrics, having excellent flame retardant, abrasion resistance, and split or tear resistance (Col 18, lines 21-26), are

Art Unit: 2831

commonly used to protect cables and pipes are sometimes formed as end cap cover configuration that provides environmental protection, including electrical protection for the joining or mechanical holding of substrates such as cables or pipes (Col 1, lines 17-21) and also provides protection for the exposed ends of cables or pipes (Col 29, lines 23-24).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed January 21, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues:

- A) Neither Andrieu nor Ratigan recognizes or solves the problems addressed by the present invention.
- B) Neither Andrieu nor Ratigan discloses a protective cover made of a high performance yarns having a tensile modulus equal to or greater than 150g/denier and a tenacity equal to or greater than 7 grams/denier and therefore the 35 USC 102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.
- C) There is no scintilla of motivation or suggestion that would prompt one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Holland or Ratigan with Andrieu and therefore the combination of the references is improper.
- D) The examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness and therefore the combination of the references is improper.
- E) The jacket of Andrieu and Ratigan is made of polyester, and therefore is not cut resistant or tear resistant material.

- F) There is not motivation to combine Andrieu or Ratigan with Kite and the examiner has not explained how one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so.
- G) The examiner is piecing together references without any explanation and therefore the combination of Andrieu or Ratigan with Holt is improper as there would be no need to protect the ends of such cables because the end would likely seriously interfere with the operation of the connected cable.

With respect to arguments A, C, & D, the examiner respectfully traverses.

Andrieu and Ratigan clearly recognize the problem of wires, ropes, and cables needing abrasion and weather protection as claimed. Specifically, Andrieu clearly discloses a protective cover (Figs 1-4) for cables or hoses (abstract), which are capable of being used in environments wherein the cover (Figs 1-4), may be subject to abrasion and weather extremes (i.e. heat, Col 1, lines 12-20). Ratigan clearly discloses a protective cover (1) for use with a rope (Figs 1-4), and which is used in environments in which lengths of the rope are subject to abrasion (Col 1, lines 5-10). While it has been admitted on the record that neither Andrieu nor Ratigan necessary disclose the material being cut resistant or tear resistant, Holland clearly teaches a protective cover, that is made of Spectra® fibers (Col 2, lines 28-37), that overcomes the disadvantages of polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment (Col 1, lines 5-10). The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be

Art Unit: 2831

established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Andrieu clearly teaches a protective cover for cables that may be made of polyester for protecting against weather elements (i.e. heat) and that is abrasion resistant as explained above. Ratigan discloses a protective cover (1) for use with a rope (Figs 1-4), and which is used in environments in which lengths of the rope are subject to abrasion (Col 1, lines 5-10). Holland clearly teaches a protective cover that is that is made of Spectra® fibers (Col 2, lines 28-37), that overcomes the disadvantages of polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment (Col 1, lines 5-10). Clearly, Andrieu, Ratigan, and Holland are concerned with the protective covers providing abrasion and weather resistant as disclose above in the rejection. While Holland, states that the protective cover may be used with cargo container, Holland clearly teaches that the protective cover can also be utilized in other applications, where the protection of interior components by a cover having the properties of abrasion and weather resistance is needed (see Col 3, lines 18-24). Therefore, there clearly does exist a motivation to modify the polyester protective cover of Andrieu or Ratigan to comprise the Spectra® fibers and the fabric parameters of the protective fabric as taught by Holland because Holland teaches that such a fabric by

Art Unit: 2831

made of commercially available Spectra® fibers and having the specified parameters, overcomes the disadvantages of polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), such as the polyester protective covers of Andrieu & Ratigan, and has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment in which the cover is used (Col 1, lines 5-10). Clearly as taught by Holland, a protective cover made of Spectra fibers not only fulfils the stated purposes of Andrieu & Ratigan (i.e. abrasion and weather resistant) but also teaches why such a protective cover is more superior than protective covers made of polyester materials, such as the protective covers of Andrieu & Ratigan. Based on the teaching of Holland, it has also been held that to be within general skill of a worker in the art to select a commercially available or known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416. Secondly, there clearly exist a reasonable expectation of success, since Holland, Ratigan, and Andrieu both teach protective covers that are utilized for some of the same purposes (i.e. abrasion and weather protection). Thirdly, the combination of Andrieu or Ratigan with Holland discloses all of the claimed invention. Therefore, all three basic criteria for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness have been met. In light of the above comments, the examiner submits that the combination of Andrieu and Holland and Ratigan and Holland are proper and just.

With respect to arguments B & E, the examiner respectfully submits that Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 14, 27, & 40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2831

With respect to argument F, the examiner respectfully traverses as it may be applied to the new rejection of claims 10-11, 23-24, and 36-37. As stated above in the rejection, modified Andrieu clearly discloses a protective cover as claimed. However, modified Andrieu doesn't necessarily disclose the sleeve being a plurality of bands comprising a short length of the fabric and being spaced apart along the length of the cable or hose (claims 10, 23, & 36), nor each band having opposed longitudinally edges including means for fastening the opposed longitudinally edges together around the length of the cable (claims 11, 24, & 37). In the cable art, it is known that cable or hose protective covers may be formed of a plurality of bands of short length fabric being spaced apart along the length of the cable or hose in order to accommodate cable breakout (i.e. separation of section of cable for the bundle of cables to go in a different direction). While the examiner has stated the above, and even the applicant admits in the Background of Invention section, that protective covers formed of a plurality of bands of short length fabric providing abrasion resistant properties and being spaced apart along the length of the cable or hose are commonly utilized (see Page 1 of applicant's spec, lines 18-21), the examiner has relied on Kite for providing a factual teaching that a plurality of bands of short length fabric utilized for providing abrasion resistant properties and being spaced apart along the length of the cable or hose are commonly utilized in the cable art to allow multiple sections or points of the cable or hose section to breakout (i.e. separated) from the bundle to being routed in a different direction (see Col 1 of Kite, lines 38-50). Therefore, not only has the applicant admitted that such a configuration is well known, Kite clearly teaches an abrasion resistant

Art Unit: 2831

protective cover having a plurality of bands is well known. Clearly, there exist a motivation to modify the protective cover of modified Andrieu to comprise a multiple protective covers as taught by applicant own admission of prior art and as taught by Kite because Kite teaches that such a well known fabric configuration protects elongated articles from abrasion (Col 4, lines 5-8) and provides effective bundling device that accommodates multiple cable break-outs (Col 1, lines 38-45). Secondly, there exist a reasonable amount of success, since such a modification is commonly made to protective covers as disclosed by applicant own admission of prior art and Kite. Thirdly, all of the claim limitations are taught by the combination and therefore, all three basic criteria for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness have been met. In light of the above comments, the examiner submits that the combination of Andrieu, Holland, and Kite is proper and just.

With respect to argument G, the examiner respectfully traverses as it may be applied to the new rejection. It is also known in the art of cables and hoses, that once a cable or hose is manufactured to a specified length, that the cable or hose is cut, thereby leaving the interior, such as conductors and insulation, exposed on the two cut ends. In order to protect the exposed interior components of the cable or hose on the cut ends, a protective hood is commonly utilized. While the examiner has stated the above, the examiner has relied on Holt for providing a factual teaching that providing exposed ends with protective covers that have excellent flame retardant, abrasion resistance, and split or tear resistance (Col 18, lines 21-26), are commonly utilized to protect exposed ends of cables and pipes (Col 29, lines 23-24) for providing

Art Unit: 2831

environmental protection, including electrical protection for the joining or mechanical holding of substrates such as cables or pipes (Col 1, lines 17-21). Therefore, clearly there exist a motivation to combine the teaches of modified Andrieu and Holt, exist a reasonable amount of success since they both deal with cable or hose applications, and all of the claimed structure is disclosed by the combination of the references. While the applicant is correct in stating that once a cable is in the field and connected to a termination point there would be no need for a protective cover, that also applies to the claimed invention. An end cap cannot be placed on the end of a cable (prior art's or applicant's claimed invention) if the cable is connected. This statement is further verified by applicant's disclosure (see Page 6 of applicant spec, lines 23-25), which states that the protective hood (i.e. end cap) is only utilized "when the cable or hose is not in use". In light of the above comments, the examiner respectfully submits that the criteria for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness has been met and therefore the combination of modified Andrieu and Holt is proper and just.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2831

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Communication

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Mayo III whose telephone number is (703) 306-9061. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 a. m. -6:00 p.m. (alternating Friday's off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on (703) 308-3682. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3432 for regular communications and (703) 305-1341 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2831

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "WHM III", written in a cursive, stylized script.

WHM III
March 13, 2003